

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action of August 23, 2007, has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claim 31 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-7 and 9-36 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

#### ***Response to 37 C.F.R. §1.131 Declaration & Exhibits***

The Office Action alleges that Applicants failed to provide mapping in detail between the support document and each limitation of the claims. Applicants have filed herewith a revised declaration under 35 C.F.R. §1.131.

#### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112***

Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claim 31 has been amended thus rendering this rejection moot.

#### ***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102***

Claims 1-5, 9-13, 24-28, 30-34 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Desktop Sidebar v 1.03 (“Desktop Sidebar”). Notwithstanding the merits of this rejection, Applicants have filed herewith a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 to remove Desktop Sidebar as a reference.

With respect to claim 4, the Office Action alleges that Desktop Sidebar discloses the feature of providing, in the tile, access to additional features not available in the application. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited passage of Desktop Sidebar merely discloses the ability to “freely arrange panels by adding, removing, moving and grouping them together.” P. 1, paragraph 6. Even assuming, without conceding, that adding, removing, moving and grouping panels together constitute additional features, Desktop Sidebar does not teach or suggest that the alleged additional features are provided *in the tile*. Further, Desktop Sidebar also lacks a teaching or suggestion that such adding, removing, moving and grouping is *not available in the application*. Accordingly, claim 4 is allowable for at least these reasons.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 – Desktop Sidebar***

Claims 14-17 and 20-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Desktop Sidebar in view of Amro *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,745, “Amro”). Claims 6 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Desktop Sidebar. Claims 7 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Desktop Sidebar in view of Kramer *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,810, hereinafter “Kramer”). Claims 29 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Desktop Sidebar in view of Oran and further in view of Kramer.

As discussed above, Desktop Sidebar has been removed as a reference. Further, the cited secondary references do not teach each and every feature of claims 6, 7, 14-19, 20-23, 29 and 35. Indeed, the Office Action does not assert that Kramer discloses every feature of the above recited claims and their respective base independent claims. Accordingly, the claims are allowable for at least these reasons.

Additionally, with respect to claims 6, 18, 29 and 35, the Office Action concedes that Desktop Sidebar fails to expressly teach hiding a taskbar application button associated with the application. Instead, the Office Action makes an unsubstantiated assertion of fact that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to implement this feature because Desktop Sidebar suggests to the skilled artisan that the desktop sidebar as taught provides a user with instant access to some of the most important daily information. P. 9, para. 13. Applicants respectfully disagree. If the Office Action is taking Official Notice of the features of claims 6, 18, 29 and 35, Applicants respectfully traverse this taking of Official Notice and request proper support for the Official Notice.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 – Amro***

Claims 1-6, 9-11, 13-18, 20-22, 25-28, 30-34 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro in view of Straub *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,745, “Straub”). Claims 12, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro in view of Straub and further in view of Oran *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,757,371, “Oran”). Claims 7, 19, 29 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable

over Amro in view of the Straub and further in view of Kramer. These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “revealing a tile in a sidebar to represent the minimized application in response to the minimize command, the sidebar configured to display a plurality of tiles corresponding to a plurality of applications, wherein revealing the tile includes displaying one or more interactive application features of the minimized application in the tile.” The Office Action concedes that Amro does not expressly teach a sidebar and displaying one or more interactive application features of a minimized application in a tile. Contrary to the Office Action’s assertions, Straub does not cure this deficiency of Amro.

The Office Action asserts that Straub discloses displaying a plurality of interactive information and displaying one or more interactive features of the minimized application in the tile. Applicants respectfully disagree. Straub discloses channel buttons 156, 158 and 160 that are selectable to determine what is shown in a viewer 140. Straub does not teach or suggest that the channel buttons are in a tile of a minimized application. The channel buttons are merely in a channel bar 144, not a sidebar tile representing a minimized application. Applicants are unsure what the Office Action is asserting as the tile in Straub’s FIG. 5. Furthermore, Straub does not teach or suggest that the channel buttons (i.e., the alleged interactive application features) correspond to *a minimized application* as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Additionally, even assuming, without conceding, that Straub discloses a sidebar and displaying one or more interactive features in a tile, there would have been no apparent reason to combine the references in the manner asserted. In particular, the Office Action alleges that it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature of a sidebar having a plurality of tiles for displaying a plurality of interactive information as taught by Straub to the user interface as taught by Amro to provide a user with instant access to some of the most important daily information. However, the Office Action fails to explain why one of skill in the art would have had a reason to include interactive features in a tile representing a minimized application rather than, e.g., including the channel bar of Straub in addition to the taskbar of Amro. As such, Applicants submit that one skilled in the art would

have had no reason to combine Straub and Amro as alleged in the Office Action. Claim 1 is thus allowable for this additional reason.

Claims 14, 25 and 31 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1 and are thus allowable for substantially the same reasons as claim 1.

With respect to claims 7, 12, 19, 23, 24, 29 and 35, neither Oran nor Kramer, either separately or in combination, cures the above-identified deficiencies of claims 1, 14, 25 and 31. Claims 7, 12, 19, 23, 24, 29 and 35 are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their base independent claims.

Claims 2-6, 9-11, 13, 15-18, 20-22, 26-28, 30, 32-34 and 36 are dependent on claims 1, 14, 25 and 31, respectively, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their base independent claim.

### **CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: December 20, 2007

By:                     /Chunhsi Andy Mu/                    

Chunhsi Andy Mu

Registration No. 58,216

1100 13th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001